

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roney et al (5,632,551) and further in view of Vilanilam et al (5,821,695).

It appears to applicants that the art relied upon by the Examiner does not show, suggest, or even vaguely describe applicants' invention. Clearly, the Examiner appears to be attempting to rely on deficiencies of the English language to bootstrap a rejection of applicants' unique structure. Applicants provide a generally solid, one-piece lamp assembly in which the circuit board is positioned within a mold in place lens material which is flowable about and through the circuit board, to encapsulate the circuit board and light emitting diodes. The lens material is juxtaposed with the circuit board and the light emitting diodes to form a generally solid body that is air-free. The claims now recite that language that shows the difference between applicants' invention and the art relied upon by the Examiner. There is nothing in the art relied upon by the Examiner that shows a generally solid body mass of material which forms the lamp assembly set out in applicants' specification and claims. In all of the art, the various pieces are put together by means of attachment devices and O-rings, for example, the O-rings 28 in Vilanilam and/or bushings 84, also shown therein. Nothing in Vilanilam, or Roney, or any of the other art of record, shows the unitary structure set out in applicants' claims.

In particular, Roney provides an air pocket or space between the circuit board/LED combination and the lens. The lens appears to be breakable and relies on the use of an aluminum housing to protect the lens. Nothing in Roney, alone or in combination with Vilanilam, provides applicants' invention. Roney specifically provides that the formable medium "... is operable to bond to the carrier, the light transmissive window and the inner surface of the housing such that the space between the carrier and the light transmissive window is hermetic." (Col. 1, lines 44-47). Roney clearly employs a separate lens assembly, and the lens assembly is structurally different from any material that encapsulates the diodes of the circuit board. Nothing in Roney shows or describes how the entire assembly can be constructed from the material that forms the lens, which is the same material that encapsulates the diodes, which is the same material that is juxtaposed to the diodes, which is the same material that encapsulates the circuit board, which is the same material that forms a one-piece unit after molding for the lamp assembly.

The particular application addresses a problem that applicants found could occur during formation of the lens. On occasion, air would be trapped, and bubbles would form in the assembly because the material could not flow evenly about the circuit board and diodes. Applicants solved the problem by employing at least one aperture, or more apertures, to permit flow of the lens material through the circuit board and about the

Appl. No. 10/003,845
Amdt. dated June 30, 2003
Reply to Office action of March 28, 2003

diodes. Claim 1 now specifically requires an aperture for communication between the first and second side of the circuit board, and the mold in place lens material being juxtaposed with the circuit board. That structure is nowhere shown or described in the art relied upon by the Examiner.

Claim 2 further requires a plurality of apertures, the apertures preventing gasses from being trapped within the moldable material during formation of the mold in place lens. Again, nothing in any of the art of record is concerned with this problem, shows similar structure, or gives applicants' result.

Claims 3 through 8 are dependent upon Claim 1 and are allowable with the base claim.

Claim 9 requires that the circuit board have at least one aperture formed in it for permitting flow of the translucent material through the circuit board. Again, that structure is nowhere shown in the art of record.

Claims 10 through 13 all depend from Claim 9, and are allowable with the base claim.

Claim 13 further includes a plurality of apertures for permitting flow of the translucent material through the circuit board.

Claims 14 through 18 all are dependent upon Claim 9 and are allowable with the base claim.

Appl. No. 10/003,845
Amdt. dated June 30, 2003
Reply to Office action of March 28, 2003

Claim 19 is amended to indicate that the moldable lens material is flowable through the aperture plurality of the circuit board. Again, the art is devoid of any suggestion of similar structure or result.

Claim 20 is amended to correct the typographical error and is allowable with the base claim.

It is respectfully suggested that the words being added to the claims are not required to distinguish the invention from the art of record, and that all of the art of record relied upon by the Examiner shows a conventional construction of a multi-part piece assembled to provide a light, but which does not show a similar construction, does not function, and does not give the same result as applicants' invention. Applicants' invention is unique in that it provides a relatively unbreakable, waterproof, one-piece lamp assembly which then may be directly inserted in an application. The art is completely devoid of any similar structure.

Appl. No. 10/003,845
Amdt. dated June 30, 2003
Reply to Office action of March 28, 2003

For the reasons that the claims distinguish structurally from the art of record, and are not shown, described or even vaguely intimated by the art, whether that art is considered singly or combination, entrance of the amendment and passage of the case to issue are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 30, 2003



Lionel L. Lucchesi, Reg. No. 25,891
Polster, Lieder, Woodruff & Lucchesi, L.C.
763 South New Ballas Road, Suite 230
St. Louis, MO 63141
(314) 872-8118